DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5006

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 10121/1069
8 October 1999

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members Distribution List, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB): MINUTES OF 16 SEPTEMBER 1999 RAB MEETING

Encl: (1) Draft Minutes of the September 16, 1999 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord

1. Draft minutes of the 16 September 1999 Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting are forwarded as enclosure (1). Any corrections or clarifications to these minutes can be provided at the next RAB meeting, at which time the minutes will be finalized.

2. The next RAB meeting is tentatively scheduled for 17 February 2000 at the Clyde Community Center.

3. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mr. Steve Gallo, the RAB Community Co-chair, at (925) 427-3450; or Mr. Stan Heller, the Navy Co-chair, at (925) 246-5672.

Wing Wong

WING WONG
By direction

Distribution:
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello
Mr. Steven Bachofer
Mr. Scott Etzel
Mr. Steve Gallo
Mr. Edward Gardner
Ms. Claudia Villacorta
Mr. David Golick/Ms. Nina Oshinsky
Mr. Stanley Heller
Ms. Dee Kilcoyne
Mr. David Kory
Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Ms. Nicole Moutoux/Ms. Roberta Blank
Mr. Marcus O'Connell

IR File

669

5090
Ser 10121/1069
8 October 1999

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB): MINUTES OF 16 SEPTEMBER 1999 RAB MEETING

Distribution (cont'd):
Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. Roy Santana/ Mr. Clint Fisher
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Mr. Larry Steinwandt
Mr. Gene Sylls

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, SEAL BEACH DETACHMENT CONCORD RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Clyde Community Center
Clyde, California

Thursday, 16 September 1999

I. Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-Chair's Report, and Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on Thursday, 16 September at the Clyde Community Center, Clyde, California at 7:09 p.m. Steve Gallo, Community Co-Chair, welcomed attendees and stated that the purpose of the RAB is to help communicate the status of the naval restoration activities to the public and to welcome public comment.

Stan Heller, NWS Concord, stated that he has not yet received a response from the Seal Beach website manager regarding the posting of Concord Detachment fact sheets on their website. Seal Beach posts their meeting minutes on the Southwest Division web page. Effective 01 October, the Concord Detachment will also be under Southwest Division, Commander-in-Chief Pacific Fleet (CINPACFLT); the name will remain the same, but the regional headquarters will be located in San Diego. Mr. Heller stated that the new organization may make the web page even more feasible.

II. Presentation on the Tidal Area Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Report and Taylor Blvd. Bridge Disposal Site RI Work Plan

Tidal Area Draft Final RI Report
John Bosche, Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI), referred to an aerial photograph during his presentation and distributed a handout. He explained that as TtEMI's installation coordinator, he is aware of the various work activities in progress, but that he is not an eco-risk assessor.

The tidal area RI covers Sites 1 (tidal area landfill), 2 (R-Area disposal site), 9 (Froid and Taylor), and 11 (Wood Hogger site), which were once part of the natural wetland. The disparity in color between the tidal area and the surrounding area is due to drainage improvements that were constructed to prevent water from coming into the area.

The land outside of the tidal area landfill is included in the RI, but not the landfill itself. There is a pending Record of Decision (ROD) on a cap for the landfill. The objective of the RI is to

determine if contamination occurs outside of the landfill and assess its impact.
The R-Area disposal site is being studied due to the potential migration of the contaminants toward the central portion of the R-Area. It is not subject to daily tidal inundation.

Spent ordnance was observed at the Froid Road and Taylor Blvd. site.

At the Wood Hogger site, wood was chipped and burned; wood chips were also used for fill.

The site investigation for the four sites was initially prepared by IT Corporation (IT Corp.) and completed in 1992. PRC (now TtEMI) prepared work plans to conduct an RI in 1994. The Draft RI Report was issued in 1997 which resulted in agency comments and requests for additional work. The Draft Final RI was completed in August 1999; the first two volumes cover the site characterization, human health risk assessment and the ecological risk assessment; and the last two volumes are the appendices.

In the course of the Draft and Final RIs, as well as the site investigation (SI), borings were drilled; monitoring wells installed; soil and groundwater samples collected and analyzed for a number of contaminants; plant and animal tissues analyzed for metals and other substances that bioaccumulate; and bioassay tests and a human health risk assessment were performed.

Much of the area is a former marshland and consists of bay mud soil, which is a fairly impermeable material. Due to the drainage construction around the R-Area, groundwater flows to a depression in the middle of the R-Area.

There is no evidence of isolated chemical spills or dumping of hazardous materials ("hot spots") that justify immediate removal. In addition, the human health risk assessment concluded that under the industrial scenario, remedial action was not suggested. Currently, the sites see very little use by Naval Weapons Station workers. It is unlikely that site use will grow to the extent that would meet the industrial use definition, which is 25 years of exposure and 250 days per year.

Under the very conservative industrial use scenario, human health is not threatened. The risk drivers were principally arsenic and benzo(a)pyrene. For the Wood Hogger site, the risk drivers were dioxins and furans, of which some concentrations were comparable to background levels.

In the ecological risk assessment, a number of different lines of evidence were considered (the "weight of evidence" approach): a flora and fauna survey to identify specific receptors; chemical analysis toxicity screening; bioassays; tissue chemical analysis of plants, invertebrates, and invertebrates; and food chain modeling to higher level receptors.

As there is no significant risk to eco-receptors, No Further Action (NFA) is recommended for all four sites. The Navy is expected to prepare an NFA ROD when agency review of the Draft Final RI is completed on 15 October. The RI will be considered to be final at that time. Any

significant agency comments will be addressed by the Navy in the next primary document, in accordance with the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA).

Mr. Gallo stated that he was of the opinion that there would be some type action for the Wood Hogger site, due to the wood preservatives and dioxins. Mr. Bosche replied that the dioxins and wood preservatives are present at low concentrations, that there is no significant or immediate risk, and that the recommendation for NFA is currently under regulatory agency review.

Nicole Moutoux, U.S. EPA, added that more specific information was collected during the second round of sampling. She has not done a thorough review, but she stated that expected concentrations were higher than what was actually measured. She is currently discussing the results of the additional ecological work with Lynn Suer and other experts.

Clint Fisher, EFA West, added that the specific purpose of the second round of sampling was to determine a possible source for dioxins due to the history of incineration. However, the results did not reveal a definite source. Ms. Moutoux noted that in regard to preservatives, pentachlorophenol (PCP) and other chemicals were not found.

Mr. Gallo inquired as to estimates on degradation for the residual contaminants. Mr. Bosche replied that the dioxin problem areas were not located in the wood chip disposal. He added that the dioxins normally result from burning operations, which was the historical usage of the area.

Mr. Gallo mentioned that Tosco reportedly violated some of their disposal permits because of dioxins discharged off site. Ms. Moutoux replied that incineration activities at times result in dioxin as a byproduct.

Based on consideration of different lines of evidence such as bioassays, food chain modeling and literature values of dose response, Mr. Bosche stated that there is no evidence of significant or immediate ecological risk.

In response to Mr. Gallo's inquiry regarding a fence around the landfill, Mr. Heller stated that it will be considered as part of the Work Plan for the cap. Mr. Gallo inquired if there will be any use restrictions on the Wood Hogger site, and Ms. Moutoux explained that an NFA recommendation would allow for any type of use.

In response to Mr. Heller's inquiry, Mr. Bosche stated that the NFA recommendation does not apply to the landfill deposition site in Site 1. The ROD will be explicit in regard to the boundaries. A separate ROD is in progress for the cap for the landfill.

Mr. Bosche added that he is uncertain that the landfill needs a fence, noting that there is no fence around the Berkeley landfill which is currently being used as a park. He stated that it is still premature to discuss plans for a road. If the detail design does not include a road, it would still be possible to drive or walk onto the landfill to perform inspections.

Mr. Gallo stated that the risk assessment concluded that the land is safe for industrial use, but pointed out that an NFA allows for any type of usage. Ms. Moutoux stated that if it is only acceptable for industrial use, there would be a restriction involved.

Mr. Heller mentioned that the Station has a wetland overlay agreement with the US Fish & Wildlife Service so that if certain properties were to be transferred, the USF&WS would be the first transferee. Therefore, it is possible that the residential issue may be a moot point because USF&WS would not allow the property to be developed. It would probably be designated a wetland area. (Meeting correction; however, on closer inspection of the USF&WS wetland preserve agreement, IR sites 2, 9 & 11 do not overlap with the National Wildlife Refuge (wetland preserve) so the residential issue for the property is not a moot point.)

Mr. Bosche added that he is uncertain if this land falls within the jurisdiction of the Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC), but that a residential development in this location would be costly due to foundation considerations. Mr. Gallo stated that there would be exposure in a park scenario and Ms. Moutoux reiterated that restrictions may be placed upon land use if deemed necessary.

Mr. Bosche stated that the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) does not prohibit a residential development if the risk is within the range of 10-4 to 10-6. The residential carcinogenic risk surrounding the landfill is 9 X 10-5; at the R-Area disposal, 4 X 10-5; at Froid and Taylor, 3 X 10-6; and at the Wood Hogger site, 2 X 10-4. The Wood Hogger site has the highest carcinogenic risk under the residential scenario and exceeds the CERCLA risk range for residential exposure.

Ms. Moutoux replied that these are "conditionally acceptable" risk ranges. Mr. Heller stated that a risk that is less than 1 X 10-4 would not be in the "gray" area. Ms. Moutoux stated that it is necessary to consider whether the number is based on one maximum concentration on one location, or if it is an average. Decisions cannot be based simply on a 1 X 10-6 number.

Mr. Bosche agreed, explaining that part of what drives the risk at this site is arsenic. It is included in calculations although it is present at background levels. He stated that the background risk cannot simply be removed from arsenic. Ms. Moutoux stated that although there may not be any restrictions, it is necessary to note the presence of arsenic. Mr. Heller stated that there would still be a risk, although it would not be cleaned up.

Steven Bachofer commented that risk should be considered with respect to the type of use and should provide for the protection of human and ecological health. He suggested a park.

Ms. Moutoux stated that there may be another discussion about the report in the future. Mr. Fisher stated that an NFA will lead to a public meeting. Mr. Heller asked if all four sites will need a deed restriction for residential health. Ms. Moutoux replied that she would have to review the report to determine this.

Mr. Heller asked about the area with risks outside of 1 X 10-4. Ms. Moutoux replied that if it is due to arsenic, it is considered to be background, and the course of action is to note its presence.

Taylor Blvd. Bridge Disposal Site RI Work Plan

Mr. Bosche stated that the site is about 90 feet by 200 feet and about one foot in depth. The only roads are above the site. High concentrations of lead present a human health and ecological risk.

The type of remedial action and its extent remains to be decided. The Work Plan proposes several investigations, one of which is to dig a number of small test holes to delineate the lateral extent and thickness of debris.

The ecological risk around the perimeter will be investigated. If the risk is not significant, the lead will be left in place which would leave the underwater environment undisturbed. This is significant in that the migration potential of a site increases when it is disturbed. Leaving the lead in place would also save money in that underwater activity is much more expensive to conduct.

If the site does pose significant ecological risk in the underwater environment, the Navy will propose clean up goals and remedial action for that area. Ms. Moutoux compared it to the Litigation Area, where two options are being weighed: either destroy the habitat to clean it up, or leave the habitat as it is. The fact that higher levels coexist with fairly good habitat is one of the reasons for conducting the remedial investigation, rather than taking remedial action.

Mr. Bachofer commented that it is adjacent to Seal Creek Marsh, a well-established waterway. Mr. Bosche observed that if there is any tidal fluctuation at that site, it is difficult to detect. Mr. Bachofer asked if it is a fresh water marsh; although Mr. Bosche did not know the answer to that question, he stated that the information is available.

Mr. Bosche stated that sediment samples will be collected in the wet area to conduct bioassay tests and analyze for metals. Invertebrate tissue will be analyzed for metals, as well as food chain modeling to calculate lower and higher dose hazard quotients.

All lines of evidence will be evaluated, as with the RI. Because this is a small site, recommendations for remediation will probably be made without additional extensive sampling. The clean up goal will be negotiated, after which the site will be cleaned up.

Mr. Bachofer commented that the site history is very minimal; he asked why there are high levels of lead. Mr. Bosche replied that the lead is collocated with the debris, which is six inches to one foot thick. He does not know from where the metal and glass originated.

Mr. Fisher added that some of the debris is so degraded that it is impossible to determine what it was. He stated that old battery debris leaves lead residuals. Ms. Moutoux added that there is not much information regarding the site. Mr. Bachofer inquired if it could possibly be aviation fuel

residuals. Mr. Fisher commented that the only petroleum-related material found are limited and scattered amounts of oil and grease.

Mr. Bosche stated that cleanup would probably entail a few truckloads and may be completed within one week. The complicating factor is the site's location on the water. The field work will begin in October or November. A Draft RI for RAB and agency review will be issued by the end of June next year. The Draft Final will follow toward the end of September. The feasibility study (FS), ROD, remedial design and remedial action will follow.

Mr. Fisher commented that the funding for the investigation should be received by the end of the month.

III. Presentation on the Draft Site Investigation Report, Site 29

Mr. Bosche described the site from one side to the other: a natural hillside, cut slope, a building with a crawl space underneath that has a low spot, asphalt driveway, vertical retaining wall, and the berm which slopes down. Outside of the berm, the hill levels out to a meadow. The building is on wooden posts that are estimated to be 18 inches high around the perimeter and about three feet high near the center of the building.

The septic tank and leach field were investigated. The septic tank was found to have some hazardous constituents, and it was pumped out and cleaned. The tank is operational although the building is not currently in use.

IT Corp. performed some sampling in the crawl space area in preparation for work underneath the building. A number of samples showed high concentrations of lead. Sampling was done outside the crawl space at greater depths to determine if the lead had migrated. Although samples showed no indication of lead migration, other metals were found.

For the crawl space soil, TtEMI revised the human health risk assessment according to EPA standards and using both residential and industrial scenarios. As there was a different data set on the periphery of the building, a human health risk assessment was done separately for the contaminants outside the building area.

Mr. Bosche stated that given the industrial exposure assumptions, there is no reason for immediate action; he added that the area is currently not being used. However, there is risk from a residential standpoint. The Navy has proposed NFA in the SI report. The EPA's primary concern is to provide appropriate documentation in the event that residential development is proposed.

Mr. Heller stated that it would be appropriate to include it in the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS). All of the closing bases develop an EBS to identify environmental hazards. Mr. Fisher

asked Ms. Moutoux if including arsenic (Site 22) in the EBS would satisfy a ROD provision that pertains to making information available. She stated that this is dependent on how that information is used. While the base is still operational, she suggested that the Navy and the EPA should meet to discuss what documents should be considered when making zoning changes.

Mr. Heller commented that timing is an issue, as they are further ahead with Site 22 than the Inland Area EBS. Whereas he does not see Site 29 reaching the ROD stage until another year has passed, which is about when the inland area EBS will be issued. Mr. Fisher stated that all of the Site 29 information will be in the EBS anyway. Mr. Bosche added that this is because the SI will be included in the Administrative Record, which is a primary resource for preparing the EBS. He commented that this is probably the best repository for information. He stated that Roy Santana, EFA West, commented that the base master plan is not widely used.

Ms. Moutoux inquired what documents base personnel use, other than the base master plan. Mr. Heller replied that at present, base personnel consult him. He stated that the EBS will replace the master plan as a future reference. The Army wants an EBS for the tidal area so that should they commence construction, they could avoid IR sites and the underground storage sites (USTs). The inland area EBS will be used primarily for Navy planning, to come up with alternate uses for the site.

Ms. Moutoux stated that the time frame is inconsequential because the only concern is residential usage, which is not probable at this point. Mr. Heller stated that the EBS will be consulted prior to property transfer anyway.

Mr. Bosche stated that EBSs have been prepared for each transferring military base in the Bay Area as a part of the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST). During the transfer process, deed restrictions are a possibility, but the EBS is the resource for making that information available.

Mr. Heller stated that it is typically a two-phase process. There is a macro level EBS for a large geographic area. For leasing a smaller property, there is a site specific EBS for a micro level EBS that focuses only on a particular location.

Mr. Bosche stated that the Phase I is performed at all of the IR and UST investigations that TtEMI deals with. Mr. Fisher added that the EBSs goes through many iterations during transfer. Ms. Moutoux stated that as more information is received, Concord would actually be further ahead than a lot of closing bases if they were not previous NPL bases. They do not have to investigate as much due to the extensive characterization that has been done previously; that EBS would not likely go through so many iterations as Alameda, for example.

In response to Mr. Gallo's inquiry, Mr. Bosche confirmed the NFA recommendation which will be accompanied with a provision for notifications. Mr. Gallo asked about the building use, and Mr. Bosche replied that it was not in use each time he has visited it. He is uncertain as to any plans for future use.

Mr. Gallo asked as to the source of the lead under the building, and Mr. Bosche replied that lead is ubiquitous in developed areas. The most common source of lead is lead-based paint. Ms. Moutoux stated that she does not believe that the lead concentrations were linked to previous activity at the building.

Mr. Heller stated that there may have been something there before the building was built which may explain the lead concentrations. Mr. Bosche reiterated that lead is present everywhere, stating that if a three-inch sample of material was removed from many residential neighborhoods, analysis would show the presence of lead (from lead based paint). Mr. Fisher added that wood floors used to be finished by painting, and the paint would go down through the seams and eventually reach the soil.

IV. Community Co-Chair Elections

Mr. Gallo stated that there are only two members from the community who actively participate in the RAB. Ms. Moutoux asked if Mr. Gallo has contact with the other community members who are listed in the mailing list. Mr. Gallo replied that he has received a request from one or two community members to remain on the mailing list.

Mr. Heller noted that community members are willing to be passive participants by obtaining information through the meeting minutes; he supported the idea of circulating fact sheets to the community. He stated that early next year, a general fact sheet update can be circulated to residents of Clyde, Concord and even Bay Point. Mr. Bachofer expressed his support for this endeavor.

Ms. Moutoux stated that if quarterly RAB meetings were held, more community members may attend. She expressed her desire to hear input from more community members.

Regarding the low community attendance at RAB meetings, Mr. Heller opined that community members may have concluded that the efforts of the regulatory agencies are sufficient; further, they appear to be content to receive updates through the meeting minutes. Mr. Gallo mentioned that he was considering speaking to RAB member Dee Kilcoyne regarding inserting a fact sheet into the local Clyde newsletter.

Mr. Heller commented that new members will have a difficult time getting up to speed with such topics as the Area of Concern (AOC).

Ms. Moutoux stated that a change in the RAB format is necessary if new members are sought. Mr. Gallo stated that seeking new members is a worthwhile effort. He asked how this would be achieved. She replied that a tour conducted two and one-half years ago resulted in a few new members, who subsequently ceased to attend. Ms. Moutoux stated that the Navy intends to work with and provide information to the public, but in the most effective way possible.

Mr. Gallo stated that holding periodic RAB meetings allow the public an opportunity to keep abreast of RAB activities. Mr. Heller emphasized that the best way to disseminate information to the public is to distribute a fact sheet through regular mail and also through a website. Mr. Gallo stated that he spoke with the County regarding using their community television, but he was uncertain as to how the information would be conveyed through that medium. He suggested involvement with the County's HAZMAT Commission or the city council meetings.

Ms. Moutoux asked if there were any responses to the most recent fact sheet that was distributed. Mr. Heller reiterated that although people are interested in the information, they do not necessarily desire to participate in the process unless there was a new and grave concern such as a plume.

He added that next year, the five-year assessment report for the litigation area remediation will be issued and should generate some public interest regarding the need for further remedial action or additional monitoring. Other issues include the removal actions for AOC 1 and Taylor and Froid Blvd. bridge, and the RODs for Site 29 and the landfill. Ms. Moutoux added that there are 4 SWMU sites being investigated in the inland area also.

Mr. Heller suggested holding meetings semi-annually and distributing fact sheet updates. The reports will still be received according to the regular schedule; the issue is whether presentations on the reports are necessary.

Mr. Gallo suggested communicating through e-mail. Ms. Moutoux also suggested telephone conference calls. Mr. Heller stated that with more complicated reports, there is a presentation by TtEMI at RPM meetings. He suggested videotaping the presentation for the RAB's benefit. Mr. Bachofer commented that in lieu of community attendance at meetings, ten-to twenty-minute videos can be viewed and comments sent or e-mailed to a designated address. Mr. Heller and Ms. Moutoux voiced their support of this suggestion, with Ms. Moutoux stating that it would be easier to solicit public input via e-mail. Mr. Gallo stated that the fact sheet can be sent as an e-mail attachment.

Mr. Gallo stated that he will remain as the designated Community Co-chair.

V. Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

Mr. Heller announced that the next meeting will be set tentatively for 17 February, 2000 at the Clyde Community Center.

VI. Adjournment [no Public Comment]

Mr. Gallo ended the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

A copy of these meeting minutes will be made available for public review at the Information Repository located at the Main Branch of the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill, CA